IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: Drury	
APPLICATION NO.: 10/564,969	**Certificate of Electronic Submission**
FILED: August 25, 2006 (U.S. National Phase of PCT/GB04/003109, filed July 19, 2004)	I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.6(a)(4) on March 19, 2010.
FOR: METHOD OF MANUFACTURING A COMPONENT FOR DROPLET DEPOSITION APPARATUS	
EXAMINER: Angwin, D.P.	Jeremy R. Kriegel, Reg. No. 39,257
ART UNIT: 3729	
CONFIRMATION NO.: 5387	

APPLICANT'S INTERVIEW SUMMARY

MS AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The Applicant's undersigned representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during a telephonic interview on February 3, 2010. During the interview, the Applicant's representative discussed various distinctions between the Gardner and Nakazawa references, why those references would not properly be combinable by a person of ordinary skill in the art, and that even if so combined, would not result in the Applicant's claims.

As to Gardner, US Patent No. 4,246,076, it was discussed that the reference shows curing of a first layer of photoresist, followed by curing a second layer of photoresist, after which all uncured photoresist material is removed, leaving only a post of cured photoresist. A metallic

material is then electroplated around the post, with *all* of the cured photoresist then removed so as to leave only the metallic material, with a bore in the region previously occupied by the cured photoresist.

As to Nakazawa, JP H06-206314, it was discussed that the reference shows etching a pressure chamber in one face of a substrate, filling that pressure chamber with a filler, forming a hole in an opposite side of the substrate, which hole is filled with photo-curing resin, masking only a central portion of that photo-curing resin, exposing the photo-curing resin to radiation, then removing the uncured resin, leaving a nozzle bore in the remaining cured portion of the resin, and finally, removing the filler material.

As these disclosures teach processes that are technically incompatible with one another, the Applicant's representative argued that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections were improper. It was also discussed that the independent method claims could be further clarified by more expressly reciting the order of operations.

Date: March 19, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Jeremy R. Kriegel, Reg. No. 39,257
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 South Wacker Drive, 6300 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel. (312) 474-6300
Fax (312) 474-0448

Attorney for Applicants